

C.C.R.B CASE CLOSING FORM

Investigator assigned: Ludwig		Team: 7	CCRB#: 9901283	<input type="checkbox"/> Force <input type="checkbox"/> Discourtesy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse <input type="checkbox"/> O.L. <input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Date of incident: 3/17/99	Time of incident: 11:20 AM	Location of incident: Dumont Avenue, Brooklyn	Pct. of occurrence: 073	Date S.O.L. Expires: 9.17.00
Date reported: 3/17/99	Time reported: 7:25 PM	To whom/where/how reported: To CCRB by telephone		
Complainant: § 87(2)(b)		Home address: § 87(2)(b)		
Victim(s): Same as above § 87(2)(b)		Home address: Address unknown		
Witness(es): § 87(2)(b)		Home address: Address unknown		
Subject officer(s) (include rank): Sgt. Ischaler Grant unidentified		Shield: 03725	Tax: 897595	Command: 073 Pct.
Witness officer(s) (include rank):		Shield:	Tax:	Command:
Allegation(s) by letter: A. Unidentified MOS abused their authority when they searched § 87(2)(b) person and car then threatened to arrest him in violation of PG 116-33, 104-01 and 110-01. B. Unidentified MOS abused their authority when they searched § 87(2)(b) in violation of PG 116-33. C. Unidentified MOS abused their authority when they searched § 87(2)(b) in violation of PG 116-33.				Recommendation(s): A. § 87(2)(g) B. § 87(2)(g) C. § 87(2)(g)

Synopsis

This complaint arose because interaction between the complainant, § 87(2)(b), his two friends, Sgt. Grant and an unidentified MOS when the officers approached § 87(2)(b) in his car because they believed that he was purchasing drugs. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) missed one scheduled appointment and has not responded to subsequent attempts at contact.

Summary of Complaint

According to the UF-245, on March 17th, 1999, at 11:20 AM, § 87(2)(b) and his friend § 87(2)(b) sitting inside of § 87(2)(b) car which was parked on Dumont Avenue in Brooklyn. From the car, the men conversed with their friend § 87(2)(b) who stood outside of the car. Sgt. Grant and his male partner approached the car and asked § 87(2)(b) for identification. Next, the officers told Mr. Gurley and § 87(2)(b) to get out of the car. When they complied the officers searched them and § 87(2)(b) as well. The officers informed § 87(2)(b) that they had approached him because they had appeared to be conducting a drug sale they also told § 87(2)(b) that if they found any drugs in the car they would impound it.

As the officers were searching the car, § 87(2)(b) informed the officers that he was married to a NYPD officer. One of the officers removed his wife's police placard from the glove compartment and informed § 87(2)(b) that both he and his wife could get in trouble because § 87(2)(b) had been brandishing the police placard. This officer threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b). The officers left without making any arrests or issuing any summonses.

Results of Investigation

On March 19th 1999 and again on March 26th, contact letters were sent to § 87(2)(b). On the following dates, calls were placed to § 87(2)(b) at home; March 19th 1999, at 5:00 PM; March 22nd 1999 at 2:48 PM; March 24th at 10:30 AM; March 29th at 8:25 AM; and April 21st at 7:15 PM. In all but one of these calls messages were left. On April 2nd, a call was received from § 87(2)(b) who scheduled an appointment for April 20th, at 10:00 AM. § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for his appointment and that same day a contact letter was sent. To date § 87(2)(b) has not responded.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In an effort to contact and interview § 87(2)(b), five calls have been made and three letters have been sent to him. § 87(2)(b) missed the appointment he scheduled and has not responded to follow up attempts. § 87(2)(g)

Investigator: _____

Date: _____

Supervisor: _____

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____